

Original citation:

Hoque, Kim, Bacon, Nicolas and Parr, David. (2014) Employer disability practice in Britain : assessing the impact of the positive about disabled people 'two ticks' symbol. Work, Employment & Society, 28 (3). pp. 430-451.

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/73535>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work of researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher statement:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0950017012472757>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: publications@warwick.ac.uk

Kim Hoque

Warwick Business School

Nick Bacon

Cass Business School, City University London

Dave Parr

East Riding College

Paper published in *Work Employment and Society*

Full reference: Hoque, K., Bacon, N. and Parr, D. (2014) 'Employer disability practice in Britain: Assessing the positive about disabled people 'Two-Ticks' symbol', *Work Employment and Society*, Vol. 28 (3), pp. 430-451.

Email for correspondence: kim.hoque@wbs.ac.uk

Employer disability practice in Britain: assessing the impact of the Positive About Disabled People ‘Two Ticks’ symbol

Abstract

Using data from a survey of union Disability Champions, this paper assesses the extent to which employers displaying the Positive About Disabled People Two Ticks symbol adhere to the five commitments they are expected to uphold, and the extent to which they provide support to Disability Champions to help them perform their role. It also assesses whether adherence to the five commitments and support for Disability Champions is greater in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces within the sample. These issues are explored in the public and private sectors separately. The analysis finds only limited adherence to the five commitments and support for Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces, no consistent evidence that adherence and support is higher in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces, and little evidence of variation between public and private sector workplaces.

Keywords

Disability, Disability Champions, equal opportunities, trade unions, Two Ticks symbol

Introduction

Launched in 1990, the Positive About Disabled People ‘Two Ticks’ symbol has become a common and highly recognisable feature on job advertisements and application forms in Britain. Awarded to employers by Jobcentre Plus, the symbol is intended to help disabled job applicants identify employers that have made positive commitments regarding the treatment of disabled people within recruitment, training and retention processes, and have sought to raise disability awareness within their organisations.

Since 1993, employers displaying the symbol have been expected to adhere to five commitments (Dibben et al., 2002, p.458), these being: to interview all disabled applicants who meet the minimum criteria for a job vacancy and to consider them on their abilities; to

discuss with disabled employees, at any time but at least once a year, what both parties can do to make sure disabled employees can develop and use their abilities; to make every effort when employees become disabled to make sure they stay in employment; to take action to ensure that all employees develop the appropriate level of disability awareness; and to review the commitments each year and assess what has been achieved, plan ways to improve on them and let employees and Jobcentre Plus know about progress and future plans (www.direct.gov.uk). Given that the commitments require employers to go beyond the requirements of the Equality Act (2010), and given that nearly one in five of the British population of working age have a long-term disability (Smith and Twomey, 2002, p.416), the symbol has the potential to influence the working lives of large numbers of people.

It would appear that employers have adopted the symbol reasonably widely. For example, Dibben et al. (2001, p. 464) found that 21 percent of the top 200 FTSE companies in their sample were displaying it, while Woodhams and Corby (2007, p.567) found its use to have increased from 27 percent of the companies surveyed in 1995 to 46 percent in 2003. Goldstone and Meager (2002, p.28) found that while 10 percent of companies within their sample were using the symbol overall, 35 percent of workplaces with 500 or more employees were displaying it. In total, between 1990 and 2012, the symbol was awarded to 8,387 employers (DWP, 2012).

However, despite the reasonably widespread uptake of the symbol, little research has been conducted on the disability practices adopted by the employers that display it. This paper therefore examines this issue drawing on a survey of trade union Disability Champions. The Disability Champion role is a lay union position that focuses specifically on representing the needs of disabled people. A formal element of the role is to audit the employer against the Two Ticks commitments, hence Disability Champions are particularly well placed to comment on issues relevant to this paper. The paper's first aim is to explore levels of

adherence to the Two Ticks commitments in the workplaces within the sample that display the symbol, and to explore whether adherence is higher in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces. Its second aim is to examine the extent to which employers displaying the Two Ticks symbol provide support to union Disability Champions to help them carry out their role, and whether support is greater in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces. Its final aim is to explore the above matters in the public and private sectors separately. As Dex and Forth (2009, p. 232) argue, much of the research on equalities to date has focused on gender and race, with less attention having been paid to other areas such as disability. By focusing on employer disability practices, therefore, this paper helps address a current gap in the literature.

The Two Ticks symbol and employer disability practice

There are several reasons why exploring the impact of the Two Ticks symbol on employer disability practice might be considered important. First, notwithstanding the variation between people with different types and severity of disability (for example, individuals with mental health-related disabilities suffer particularly poor labour market outcomes, see: Jones et al., 2006, p.444), there is considerable evidence that the disabled occupy a poor labour market position. For example, the employment rate for disabled people and those with long-term health problems in Britain is estimated in the latest Labour Force Survey (January-March 2012) to be 51 percent compared with 77 percent for the non-disabled (ONS, 2012). The disabled are also over-represented in low-skilled and low-status jobs (Goldstone and Meager, 2002; Smith and Twomey, 2002, p.423), and they experience disadvantage in career progression and access to training opportunities (Jones, 2008, p.414). In addition, they are paid significantly less (Jones, 2008, pp.408-409; Jones et al., 2006, p.444; Smith and Twomey, 2002, p.425), and are almost twice as likely to be unemployed (EOC, 2006, p.13;

Smith and Twomey, 2002, p.420). Only about half of these unemployment and earnings differences can be explained by differences in human capital and productivity characteristics (Kidd et al., 2000). Given this, it is important to identify whether the initiatives in place to improve labour market outcomes for disabled people – such as the Two Ticks symbol – are having the desired effect.

A second reason why exploring the Two Ticks symbol might be considered important concerns the paucity of disability practices within British workplaces. For example, by 2006 only a minority of public sector organisations had introduced arrangements to consult disabled employees (Equal Opportunities Review 2006, p. 12-13). In addition, the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey found that only 23 percent of workplaces monitored recruitment and selection and 9 percent monitored promotions by disability, while only 19 percent reviewed recruitment and selection procedures, 10 percent reviewed promotion procedures and 4 percent reviewed relative pay rates by disability (Kersley et al., 2006, p.246, 248). Woodhams and Corby (2007, p.568) found an increase in some disability practices (recruitment monitoring, awareness training and documentation reviews) as a result of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, but a decrease in positive action measures such as work introduction schemes. In essence, the uptake of disability measures in British workplaces remains ‘disappointingly low’ (Woodhams and Danieli, 2000, p.408). Given this, it is worth investigating whether the Two Ticks symbol has the potential to engender improvements in employer practice. Only if this is the case would it be wise to advocate greater employer engagement with it.

A final reason for the importance of a deeper understanding of the Two Ticks symbol relates to the government’s plans to reduce the number of disability benefit claimants. There are currently 2.63 million people on disability benefits (National Audit Office, 2010), of which the government plans to move one million into employment (Jones and Latreille, 2009,

p. 207). However, these plans are arguably dependent on employer receptiveness to the notion of employing disabled people in greater numbers. The reasonably widespread use of the Two Ticks symbol suggests that for many employers, this may indeed be the case. This conclusion can only be reached, however, if it can be demonstrated that Two Ticks employers are genuinely adhering to the commitments expected of them.

However, as mentioned earlier, little is known about the disability practices adopted by Two Ticks employers. Dickens (2005, p.179) argues that its increasing adoption suggests on the surface that employers are taking disability issues more seriously. By contrast, the Trades Union Congress has raised concerns over the disability practices implemented by Two Ticks employers, highlighting the lack of independent monitoring or governance arrangements to review how employers meet the five commitments (Trades Union Congress, 2009). Although it is JobCentre Plus policy to review annually all Two Ticks employers to audit adherence to the commitments, it does not keep data on how many reviews have been undertaken and how many reviews have resulted in the symbol being withdrawn (DWP, 2012).

This apparent paucity of independent checks on employers is a central issue in considering the likely impact of the Two Ticks symbol, not least given its suggestion that the symbol is underpinned by a neo-liberal philosophy within which improvements in employer disability practices are not seen as requiring enforcement or compulsion but instead can (and should) be left to the market. On the one hand, this might suggest that the employers that have chosen to display the symbol have done so as they recognise a business case for adhering to its commitments. Hence, one might anticipate disability practice to be considerably better in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces. On the other hand, employers often do not perceive a business case where disability is concerned (Dibben et al. 2001; Woodhams and Danieli, 2000), given the potential costs involved in making necessary

workplace adjustments (Dickens, 2005, p.191) and a failure to recognise the specific skills or abilities that disabled people possess. It is possible, therefore, that many of the employers who display the symbol are doing so not because of a desire to make genuine improvements to disability practice, but instead to secure its broader reputational benefits and to give the impression of a concern for disability issues. It is generally acknowledged that as a result of Britain's largely neo-liberal, voluntarist approach to equality, equal opportunities policies are often little more than 'empty shells' containing little of substance to protect those in positions of disadvantage (Hoque and Noon, 2004). Should the analysis find that the Two Ticks symbol also constitutes an 'empty shell', this might be interpreted as a further indication of the limitations of what neo-liberal, voluntarist approaches to equality are able to achieve.

The little research undertaken on the disability practices in Two Ticks workplaces has, however, proved inconclusive with regard to this issue. Woodhams and Corby (2007) found the proportion of disabled employees to be higher in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces, while Goldstone and Meager (2002) found formal disability practices and the active encouragement of disabled applicants to be more widespread. Against this, however, Dibben et al. (2001) found little evidence of disability receiving greater attention at the highest levels in large (FTSE) companies displaying the symbol. Hence it remains open to question whether the Two Ticks symbol does indeed constitute an 'empty shell'. By exploring adherence to the Two Ticks commitments and support for Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces, therefore, this paper seeks to add further to this debate.

In addressing this issue, however, one might expect differences to emerge between the public and private sectors. This is for two main reasons. The first concerns differences in cultural values (Woodhams and Corby, 2007, p. 570), reflected not least by the efforts of some local authority employers dating back to the 1980s to promote the employment of disabled people (ibid, p. 559). Given this, one might expect greater efforts in the public than

the private sector to uphold the Two Ticks commitments and to provide support for Disability Champions. Second, since December 2006 public employers have been subject to a positive duty to promote disability equality (Disability Rights Commission, 2005). Arguably, public sector managers might seek to uphold the Two Ticks commitments and support Disability Champions to demonstrate adherence to this duty. That said, a survey of 65 public sector organisations prior to the introduction of the positive duty revealed that many respondents did not know whether their organisation supported the Two Ticks symbol, over one-third did not know how many disabled people were employed by their organisation, and less than one-quarter had arranged training on disability issues for all staff involved in recruitment (Equal Opportunities Review, 2006). In addition, adherence to the public sector race equality duty introduced in 2003 has been limited (Dex and Forth, 2009, p. 251; Kersley et al. 2006, p. 244), suggesting that the effect of the disability equality duty may also have been weak. Nevertheless, the paper's final aim is to explore whether there is a stronger relationship between the Two Ticks symbol and adherence to the Two Ticks commitments and support for Disability Champions in the public than the private sector.

Data and Methods of Analysis

The analysis uses data from a survey of trade union Disability Champions conducted between June and November 2010. The survey was distributed to all Disability Champions who had attended the Trades Union Congress-sponsored Disability Champion training course. Union representatives undergo this training before becoming Disability Champions, hence the whole Disability Champion population was surveyed. The survey was conducted online with participants being emailed a link. Hard copies or alternative formats were offered to respondents on request. The link was distributed to 497 Disability Champions, of whom 159 replied (representing a response rate of 32 percent). 116 responses were used once

respondents who undertook the training but were not playing the role and once observations with missing data were excluded. As discussed earlier, Disability Champions might be well placed to comment on the issues addressed by this paper given their specific area of expertise. It must be remembered, however, that the sample is not representative of all Two Ticks workplaces, particularly given that non-union workplaces – which comprise 84 per cent of private sector workplaces with 10 or more employees (Kersley et al., 2006, p. 119) – are excluded from the sample. The implications of this for the interpretation of the results are discussed later on.

The paper's first aim is to assess the extent to which the employers within the sample that display the Two Ticks symbol adhere to the five commitments, and whether adherence is higher in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces. Respondents were asked whether the employer adheres to each commitment on a four-point scale where 4 = always and 1 = never. A scale was also created concerning the number of commitments adhered to¹. These measures were cross-tabulated with a dichotomous variable where 1 = Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces and 0 = Disability Champions in non-Two Ticks workplaces, and chi2 statistics (or a t-test for the continuous variable concerning the number of commitments adhered to) were calculated to identify differences in adherence between each cohort.

It is possible, however, that any variation between the two cohorts might be explained by differences in observable workplace and organisational characteristics (sector, workplace and organisational size, for example). Multivariate analysis was therefore conducted to control for these characteristics. The control variables are described in the Appendix table. Ordered probit was used given the categorical nature of the dependent variables, except for the analysis of the number of commitments adhered to, for which ordinary least squares was used.

The paper's second aim is to assess the extent to which Two Ticks employers provide support to Disability Champions to help them perform their role, and whether support is greater in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces. Disability Champions were asked whether the employer provides them with: sufficient office space; sufficient communication equipment (e.g. phone, email, internet); reasonable time off to conduct the role; and adequate information to conduct the role. They were also asked whether the employer has a disability or equality committee and whether they attend this committee in their Disability Champion capacity, and whether managers at their workplace value their Disability Champion role (on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5=strongly agree and 1=strongly disagree). These measures were cross-tabulated with the dichotomous Two Ticks variable described above and chi2 statistics were calculated to identify variation between Two Ticks and non-Two Ticks workplaces.

Multivariate analysis was also conducted to identify whether the relationships identified held once observable organisational and workplace characteristics were controlled for. Controls for individual characteristics (described in the Appendix table) were also included². The analysis was conducted using probit except for the analysis of whether managers value the Disability Champion's activities, for which ordered probit was used.

The paper's third aim is to explore whether there is a stronger relationship between the Two Ticks symbol and adherence to the Two Ticks commitments and support for Disability Champions in the public than the private sector workplaces within the sample. A dichotomous variable was created where 1=Disability Champions in public sector workplaces and 0= Disability Champions in private sector workplaces (voluntary sector workplaces were excluded). This was then interacted with the Two Ticks variable. The combined significance of the interaction term and the main effect coefficients was then calculated to identify whether a Two Ticks effect existed in one sector but not the other.

Results

Adherence to the five Two Ticks commitments

The paper's first aim is to assess how far the workplaces within the sample that display the Two Ticks symbol adhere to the five Two Ticks commitments, and whether adherence is greater in the Two Ticks than in the non-Two Ticks workplaces. The bivariate results, presented in table 1, suggest overall adherence to the five commitments in the Two Ticks workplaces is somewhat limited. On average, the Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces state that only 1.93 of the five commitments are fully adhered to, and 18 percent claim that none are fully adhered to. The results also demonstrate that while Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces are slightly more positive (at the 8 percent significance level) than are their counterparts in the non-Two Ticks workplaces in terms of whether the employer interviews all disabled applicants who meet the minimum criteria for a vacancy, they are no more likely to state that their employer adheres to the other four commitments.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

The multivariate analysis controlling for sector, organisation size and workplace size, presented in Table 2, verifies the results of the bivariate analysis, with no differences emerging between the Two Ticks and the non-Two Ticks workplaces in terms of adherence to the five commitments, with the exception that Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces are slightly more likely (at the 10 percent significance level) to state that the employer interviews all disabled employees who meet the minimum criteria. The analysis of the overall number of commitments adhered to further confirms that adherence is no greater in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces within the sample.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Support for Disability Champions

The paper's second aim is to assess the support Two Ticks employers provide for Disability Champions, and whether support is greater in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces within the sample. The bivariate results in table 3 reveal no statistically significant differences between the two cohorts. They also suggest that some elements of support within the Two Ticks workplaces are somewhat limited. For example, only just over half of Disability Champions in the Two Ticks workplaces state that managers provide them with reasonable time off, and only 46 percent state that their employer provides them with adequate information. Additionally, 40 percent of Disability Champions in Two Ticks workplaces disagree or strongly disagree that managers value them, while only 24 percent agree or strongly agree with this statement.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

The multivariate analysis, reported in table 4, demonstrates that the lack of significance within the bivariate results remains once workplace, organisational and individual characteristics are controlled for, with the exception that a weak positive Two Ticks effect emerges with regard to whether the employer provides sufficient office equipment.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

Public/private sector differences

The paper's third aim is to explore whether there is a stronger relationship between the Two Ticks symbol and adherence to the five commitments and support for Disability Champions in the public than the private sector workplaces within the sample. The results are reported in table 5.

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

Turning first to adherence to the five commitments, there is no evidence in the public sector subsample of greater adherence to the commitments in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces (as demonstrated by the lack of significance of the combined coefficient of the interaction term and the Two Ticks coefficient). In the private sector, adherence to three of the five commitments is higher in the Two Ticks than the non-Two Ticks workplaces (as demonstrated by the Two Ticks workplaces coefficients). There is no evidence, therefore, of a stronger Two Ticks effect in the public than the private sector concerning adherence to the five commitments. If anything the opposite is true.

Turning to the support given to Disability Champions, the public sector results (as demonstrated by the significance of the combined coefficient of the interaction term and Two Ticks coefficient) suggest only a weak Two Ticks effect, with equality/ disability forums in which the Disability Champion participates being more prevalent in Two Ticks than non-Two Ticks workplaces, and communication equipment being slightly more likely to be provided (at the 10 percent significance level). Where the private sector is concerned, none of the Two Ticks workplaces have equality/ disability forums in which the Disability Champion participates. Where the other forms of support are concerned, the results (as demonstrated by the Two Ticks workplaces coefficients) suggest no differences between Two Ticks and non-

Two Ticks private sector workplaces. In neither sector, therefore, was there evidence of a consistent Two Ticks effect with regard to the support given to Disability Champions, and there was no consistent evidence of a stronger effect in the public than the private sector.

Also notable with regard to these results is that there is no evidence in tables 2 and 4 that adherence to the five commitments and support for Disability Champions is any greater in the public than the private sector workplaces in the sample. Hence, the lack of a consistent Two-Ticks effect in the public sector is not explained by higher overall levels of adherence to the five commitments or support for Disability Champions within the sector.

Discussion and Conclusions

This paper has sought to shed light on the disability practices adopted by employers displaying the Positive About Disabled People ‘Two Ticks’ symbol. In the event, notwithstanding the caveats outlined above with regard to the representativeness of the sample, the results suggested that adherence to the commitments and support for Disability Champions was limited in the Two Ticks workplaces. Additionally, there was very little evidence that the Two Ticks workplaces were more likely to adhere to the five Two Ticks commitments or provide support for Disability Champions than were the non-Two Ticks workplaces. There was also no consistent evidence of a stronger Two Ticks effect in the public than the private sector, suggesting that in both sectors, the symbol may in many instances comprise little more than an ‘empty shell’ (Hoque and Noon, 2004)

These results have several important implications. First, as argued earlier, given its reliance on employer goodwill and self-enforcement, the Two Ticks symbol might be viewed as underpinned by a neo-liberal, voluntarist philosophy within which compulsion is seen as neither necessary nor desirable. Such an approach will only lead to improvements in employer disability practice, however, should employers perceive a business case for such

improvements. The lack of difference in adherence to the five commitments or levels of support for Disability Champions between the Two Ticks and non-Two Ticks workplaces suggests, though, that the employers displaying the symbol are doing so not because they have identified a business case for disability, but instead in order to secure its reputational benefits. Hence, the results support the argument made by Dibben et al. (2001) and Woodhams and Danieli (2000) that where employer recognition of a business case for equality is limited, there is little hope that a neo-liberal voluntarist approach will deliver improvements. This in turn suggests that the Two Ticks symbol is unlikely to have a significant positive impact unless it moves away from its neo-liberal underpinnings, and a degree of regulation, possibly in the form of an independent awarding and monitoring body as called for by the Trades Union Congress (2009), is introduced to ensure compliance with the five commitments.

Second, with regard to the public sector results, as argued earlier, adherence to the five commitments and the provision of support for Disability Champions could be viewed as ways in which public sector managers might demonstrate adherence to the disability equality duty. Notwithstanding the caveat that the public sector Disability Champions might apply a stricter criteria than their private sector counterparts in assessing adherence to the commitments and the support they receive, the results pointing to limited adherence to the Two Ticks commitments and support for Disability Champions in the public sector workplaces within the sample could be interpreted as suggesting that the duty has had little effect thus far. They might also be viewed as indicative of the abandonment of notions of the state as a ‘model employer’ in favour of ‘New Public Management’ principles that focus on narrowing the gap between public and private sector practice and the introduction of free market principles into public organisations (Dunleavy and Hood, 1994).

Third, the results have implications for the government's plans to move large numbers of people off disability benefits and into employment (Jones and Latreille, 2009, p. 207). As suggested earlier, these plans are in part dependent upon employer receptiveness to the notion of employing disabled people in larger numbers. The results here imply that the relatively widespread adoption of the Two Ticks symbol cannot be taken as indicative of this, given the limited adherence among many Two Ticks employers to the commitments expected of them and their limited support for Disability Champions.

In reaching these conclusions, however, one must remember that while the sample used here has the advantage that the respondents are likely to be well informed about employer disability practice, it has the disadvantage that it is not representative of all (especially private sector) Two Ticks workplaces, particularly given that non-union private sector workplaces, which comprise 84 percent of private sector workplaces with 10 or more employees (Kersley et al., 2006, p. 119) are excluded from the sample. As Author A and Author B demonstrate, EO practices are particularly poor within such workplaces. Given this, it is possible that the private sector estimates are biased upwards, and that a more representative sample might yield greater public-private sector differences than identified in this paper. A more representative sample might also facilitate a more accurate estimation of overall levels of adherence to the Two Ticks commitments. One might expect the workplaces in the sample used in this paper (i.e. unionised workplaces with a Disability Champion) to be among the best in terms of the implementation of disability practices. Were the analysis to be replicated using a more representative sample, overall levels of adherence to the Two Ticks commitments may be found to be even lower than reported here.

Further research on the Two Ticks symbol drawing on more representative samples is therefore needed to confirm or refute the results reported in this paper. This research might also seek to ascertain employers' views of whether the Two Ticks symbol has engendered

changes in practice, and also disabled employees' views of whether adoption of the symbol leads to their needs being addressed. There is also scope for qualitative research that seeks to address in greater depth the reasons why the symbol appears to have had only a limited impact. While the analysis here has yielded some potentially interesting insights, developing a body of evidence using a variety of data and methodological approaches will provide a clearer picture of the extent to which the Two Ticks symbol has the potential, in its current neo-liberal and voluntarist guise, to generate improvements in employer disability practice in Britain.

Notes

¹ Workplaces were considered to be upholding each commitment if the Disability Champion stated that it was 'always' adhered to.

² Controls for Disability Champion individual characteristics are not included in the earlier equations assessing employer adherence to the Two Ticks commitments as there are no reasons why employer adherence to the commitments might be affected by these characteristics. The results do not change, however, if these characteristics are controlled for.

References

Author A and Author B

Dex, S. and Forth, J. (2009) 'Equality and diversity at work'. In W. Brown, A. Bryson, J. Forth and K. Whitfield (eds) *The Evolution of the Modern Workplace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 230-255.

- Dibben, P., James, P. and Cunningham, I. (2001) 'Senior management commitment to disability: the influence of legal compulsion and best practice', *Personnel Review* 30 (4): 454-467.
- Dibben, P., Cunningham, I. and Smythe, D. (2002) 'Employers and employees with disabilities in the UK: An economically beneficial relationship?', *International Journal of Social Economics* 29 (6): 453-467.
- Dickens, L. (2005) 'Walking the Talk? Equality and diversity in employment', in Bach S. (ed.) *Managing Human Resources*, 4th edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Disability Rights Commission (2005) *The Duty to Promote Disability Equality, Statutory Code of Practice, England and Wales*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Dunleavy, P. and Hood, C. (1994) 'From old public administration to new public management'. *Public Money and Management*, 14 (3): 9-16.
- DWP (2012) *Response to FoI Request No1542*. Sheffield: Department of Work and Pensions.
- EOC (2006) *Facts about men and women in Britain*. Equal Opportunities Commission.
- Equal Opportunities Review (2006) Disability Equality Duty: an EOR Survey. No. 159: 6-13.
- Goldstone, C. and Meager, N. (2002) *Barriers to Employment for Disabled People*. Research Report 95. Department of Work and Pensions
- Hoque, K. and Noon M. (2004) 'Equal opportunities policy and practice in Britain: evaluating the 'empty-shell' hypothesis'. *Work, Employment and Society*, 18 (3), 481-506.
- Jones, M. (2008) 'Disability and the labour market: a review of the empirical evidence', *Journal of Economic Studies* 35 (5): 405-424.
- Jones, M. and Latreille, P. (2009) 'Disability, health and the labour market: evidence from the Welsh Health Survey', *Local Economy* 24 (3): 192-210.
- Jones, M., Latreille, P. and Sloane, P. (2006) 'Disability, gender, and the British labour market', *Oxford Economic Papers* 58: 407-449.
- Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J., Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix, G. and Oxenbridge, S. (2006) *Inside the Workplace: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey*. London: Routledge.
- Kidd, M., Sloane, P. and Ferko, I. (2000) 'Disability and the labour market: an analysis of British males', *Journal of Health Economics* 19: 961-981.
- National Audit Office (2010) *Support to incapacity benefits claimants through pathways to work*, Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General (www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/hc1011/hc00/0021/0021.pdf, Accessed 7th October, 2011)

ONS (2012) Table A08 Labour Market Status of Disabled People (Last Updated May 2012). Office for National Statistics.

Smith, A. and Twomey, B. (2002) 'Labour market experiences of people with disabilities', *Labour Market Trends* August: 415-427.

Trades Union Congress (2009) 'Congress Decisions 2009' www.tuc.org.uk/the_tuc/tuc-17093-f0.pdf. Accessed 11th October, 2011.

Woodhams, C. and Corby, S. (2007) 'Then and now: disability legislation and employers' practices in the UK', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 45 (3): 556-580.

Woodhams, C. and Danieli, A. (2000) 'Disability and diversity – a difference too far?' *Personnel Review* 29 (3): 402-416.

www.direct.gov.uk/en/DisabledPeople/Employmentsupport/LookingForWork/DG_4000314. Accessed 7th October, 2011.

Table 1: Adherence to Two Ticks commitments in Two Ticks and non-Two Ticks workplaces

	Two Ticks Workplaces (%)	Non-Two Ticks workplaces (%)	Chi2/ t-test
Employer interviews all disabled applicants who meet the minimum criteria for a job vacancy (n=87):			
Always	82	71	
Sometimes	11	24	
Rarely	8	0	
Never	0	5	pr=0.073*
Employer makes sure that disabled employees can discuss, at least once a year, how they can best develop their skills (n=92):			
Always	29	23	
Sometimes	34	41	
Rarely	13	23	
Never	24	14	pr=0.501
Employer makes every effort to help any employee who becomes disabled to stay in work (n=103):			
Always	38	33	
Sometimes	42	56	
Rarely	18	11	
Never	1	0	pr=0.590
Employer takes action to make sure all staff know what support disabled people need from them (n=102):			
Always	21	12	
Sometimes	33	54	
Rarely	36	19	
Never	11	15	pr=0.158
Employer looks once a year at what has been done to support disabled employees and how to do it better (n=90):			
Always	21	9	
Sometimes	32	41	
Rarely	32	27	
Never	15	23	pr=0.499
Number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to ¹ (n=68):			
All	15	0	
Four	5	0	
Three	13	15	
Two	11	23	
One	38	31	
None	18	31	
Mean number of commitments adhered to	1.93	1.23	pr=0.159

Note: number of observations varies as respondents answering 'Don't know' are removed from each calculation.

¹ Definition of 'adhered to': respondent states employer 'always' adheres to the commitment in question

Table 2: Adherence to Two Ticks commitments: multivariate analysis

	Employer interviews all disabled employees who meet the minimum criteria		Employer makes sure that all disabled employees can discuss, at least once a year how they can best develop and use their skills		Employer makes every effort to help any employee who becomes disabled to stay in work	
Two Ticks workplace	0.822	(0.486)*	0.092	(0.303)	0.245	(0.297)
Sector (reference category: Public sector)						
Private sector	-1.005	(0.593)*	-0.028	(0.460)	0.045	(0.396)
Not-for-profit/ voluntary sector	(a)		0.233	(0.580)	0.292	(0.513)
Industry group (reference category: Public administration and defence):						
Education	-1.355	(0.639)**	-0.664	(0.440)	-0.752	(0.425)*
Health and social work	-1.123	(0.667)*	-0.219	(0.428)	-0.441	(0.480)
Transport, storage and communications	-1.380	(1.056)**	-0.855	(0.410)**	-0.683	(0.383)*
Other community, social and personal services	0.366	(1.015)	-0.850	(0.476)*	-0.426	(0.430)
Other industry sector	-0.325	(0.687)	0.058	(0.482)	0.469	(0.435)
Workplace size (reference category: 50 employees or less)						
51-100 employees			-0.606	(0.654)	0.400	(0.591)
101-250 employees	-2.680	(1.189)**	0.076	(0.528)	-0.374	(0.493)
251-500 employees	-2.092	(1.055)**	-0.271	(0.455)	-0.784	(0.475)*
501-1000 employees	-1.472	(1.058)	-0.478	(0.478)	-0.017	(0.504)
Over 1000 employees	-1.755	(0.980)*	-0.409	(0.401)	-0.426	(0.409)
Organisation size (reference category: 999 emp's or less)						
1000-4999 employees	-1.594	(0.889)*	-0.279	(0.477)	-1.012	(0.470)**
5000-9999 employees	-0.641	(0.941)	-0.768	(0.504)	-0.689	(0.489)
10000 employees or more	-1.378	(0.808)*	-0.484	(0.452)	-1.212	(0.451)***
Pseudo R2	0.236		0.060		0.109	
N	87		92		103	
	Employer takes action to make sure all staff know what support disabled people need from them		Employer looks every year at what has been done to support disabled employees and how to do it better		Number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to	
Two Ticks workplace	0.230	(0.280)	0.403	(0.297)	0.743	(0.545)
Sector (reference category: Public sector)						
Private sector	-0.228	(0.418)	-0.076	(0.456)	-1.030	(0.901)
Not-for-profit/ voluntary sector	0.278	(0.451)	0.285	(0.473)	0.086	(0.888)
Industry group (reference category: Public administration and defence):						
Education	-0.114	(0.403)	-0.369	(0.468)	-0.081	(0.817)
Health and social work	0.188	(0.413)	-0.281	(0.424)	-0.247	(0.708)
Transport, storage and communications	-0.373	(0.369)	-0.659	(0.386)*	-0.977	(0.635)
Other community, social and personal services	-0.054	(0.415)	-0.668	(0.445)	-0.270	(0.871)
Other industry sector	0.921	(0.448)**	-0.194	(0.479)	1.353	(0.888)
Workplace size (reference category: 50 employees or less)						
51-100 employees	-0.201	(0.521)	-0.326	(0.557)	0.029	(1.000)
101-250 employees	-0.520	(0.471)	-0.166	(0.488)	0.072	(0.844)
251-500 employees	-0.379	(0.442)	-0.106	(0.475)	0.121	(0.802)
501-1000 employees	-0.486	(0.448)	-0.421	(0.501)	0.196	(0.895)
Over 1000 employees	-0.131	(0.386)	0.067	(0.411)	-0.195	(0.686)
Organisation size (reference category: 999 emp's or less)						
1000-4999 employees	-0.830	(0.424)**	-1.009	(0.463)**	-1.707	(0.832)**
5000-9999 employees	-0.835	(0.443)*	-0.849	(0.487)*	-1.432	(0.832)*
10000 employees or more	-0.819	(0.418)**	-1.270	(0.454)***	-1.714	(0.801)**
Pseudo R2	0.075		0.080			
Adjusted R2					0.031	
N	102		90		68	

Notes:

Coefficients given, standard errors in brackets. *** significant at 1 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; * significant at 10 percent
 All dependent variables are based on a 4 point scale where 4=always, 3=sometimes, 2=rarely and 1=never, except for the dependent variable for the number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to (count measure)

Ordered probit used except for the analysis of the number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to (OLS).

(a)Not-for-profit and public sector combined as all not-for-profit respondents state that the employer always interviews all disabled employees who meet the minimum criteria

Table 3: Employer support for Disability Champions in Two Ticks and non-Two Ticks workplaces

	Two Ticks workplaces n=82 %	Non-Two Ticks workplaces n=34 %	Chi2
<hr/>			
To conduct the Disability Champion role, the employer provides:			
Sufficient office space	54	59	pr=0.611
Sufficient communication equipment (e.g. phone, email, internet)	74	62	pr=0.174
Reasonable time off	51	53	pr=0.866
Adequate information	46	62	pr=0.130
Employer has a disability or equality committee/ forum which the Disability Champion regularly attends	37	24	pr=0.173
Do managers value your Disability Champion activities?			
Strongly agree	6	12	
Agree	18	29	
Neither agree nor disagree	37	38	
Disagree	20	6	
Strongly disagree	20	15	pr=0.233
<hr/>			

Table 4: Employer support for Disability Champions: multivariate analysis

	Employer provides:					
	Sufficient office space		Sufficient communication equipment		Reasonable time off	
Two Ticks workplace	0.276	(0.399)	0.755	(0.435)*	-0.396	(0.456)
Sector (reference category: Public sector):						
Private sector	0.886	(0.531)*	0.498	(0.547)	-0.600	(0.607)
Not-for-profit/ voluntary sector	0.411	(0.731)	-1.030	(0.729)	0.308	(0.745)
Industry group (reference category: Public administration and defence):						
Education	-0.375	(0.660)	-0.358	(0.761)	0.030	(0.817)
Health and social work	-0.066	(0.641)	0.320	(0.736)	0.911	(0.736)
Transport, storage and communications	-0.395	(0.520)	-0.313	(0.530)	-0.639	(0.585)
Other community, social and personal services	-0.875	(0.670)	0.358	(0.662)	0.864	(0.682)
Other industry sector	0.707	(0.627)	0.542	(0.634)	1.189	(0.664)*
Workplace size (reference category: 50 employees or less)						
51-100 employees	2.031	(0.955)**	1.306	(0.814)	0.185	(0.735)
101-250 employees	0.479	(0.693)	-0.015	(0.712)	0.696	(0.784)
251-500 employees	0.196	(0.627)	-0.354	(0.658)	0.638	(0.662)
501-1000 employees	0.634	(0.613)	-0.357	(0.650)	1.578	(0.722)**
Over 1000 employees	0.412	(0.568)	0.175	(0.630)	2.135	(0.677)***
Organisation size (reference category: 999 employees or less)						
1000-4999 employees	0.575	(0.652)	0.689	(0.770)	2.165	(0.797)***
5000-9999 employees	-0.401	(0.652)	-0.838	(0.660)	0.428	(0.743)
10000 employees or more	-0.766	(0.628)	-0.575	(0.656)	-0.359	(0.725)
Occupational groups represented (reference category: managers, senior officials and professionals)						
Managers, senior officials and professionals and non-management staff	0.036	(0.645)	-0.855	(0.658)	-0.871	(0.663)
Non-management staff only	-0.553	(0.627)	-0.961	(0.614)	-1.366	(0.706)*
Age (reference category: 44 years old or younger):						
45-49 years old	-0.248	(0.504)	0.120	(0.480)	0.295	(0.501)
50-54 years old	-0.177	(0.512)	-0.272	(0.542)	0.515	(0.533)
55-59 years old	-0.011	(0.596)	1.019	(0.722)	1.411	(0.761)*
60 years old or older	-0.142	(0.574)	0.866	(0.661)	0.646	(0.648)
Time spent as Disability Champion (reference category: less than one year)						
1 to less than 2 years	-0.705	(0.559)	-0.104	(0.563)	0.339	(0.602)
2 to less than 5 years	-0.381	(0.483)	0.039	(0.510)	-0.438	(0.538)
5 to less than 10 years	-0.399	(0.539)	-0.672	(0.568)	-1.192	(0.622)*
Hours per week spent on Disability Champion activity (reference category: Less than one hour):						
1 to less than 2 hours	-0.066	(0.527)	0.642	(0.607)	1.271	(0.629)**
2 to less than 5 hours	-0.637	(0.512)	-0.449	(0.511)	0.789	(0.590)
5 hours or more	-0.093	(0.556)	-0.230	(0.577)	0.648	(0.675)
Previously held another union post	0.162	(0.836)	0.313	(0.777)	0.696	(0.745)
Holds another union post	1.279	(0.663)*	0.659	(0.535)	0.425	(0.587)
Female	-0.331	(0.368)	-0.210	(0.365)	-1.245	(0.443)***
Ethnic minority	-0.182	(0.525)	0.307	(0.577)	0.334	(0.588)
Long-term illness, health problem or disability	-0.836	(0.393)**	-0.348	(0.419)	-1.592	(0.495)***
Pseudo R2	0.325		0.280		0.385	
N	116		116		116	

	Employer provides adequate information		Managers value disability champion's activities		Equality/disability forum in which the Disability Champion participates	
Two Ticks workplace	-0.018	(0.398)	-0.203	(0.271)	0.416	(0.419)
Sector (reference category: Public sector):						
Private sector	0.470	(0.554)	0.118	(0.377)	-0.826	(0.610)
Not-for-profit/ voluntary sector	1.931	(0.748)***	0.790	(0.479)*	2.118	(0.811)***
Industry group (reference category: Public administration and defence):						
Education	-1.107	(0.689)	-0.681	(0.507)	-0.144	(0.722)
Health and social work	-0.518	(0.696)	-0.577	(0.450)	0.199	(0.632)
Transport, storage and communications	-0.465	(0.514)	-1.157	(0.388)***	0.825	(0.569)
Other community, social and personal services	-0.388	(0.669)	-0.225	(0.437)	-1.392	(0.910)
Other industry sector	0.488	(0.603)	0.277	(0.420)	0.596	(0.617)
Workplace size (reference category: 50 employers or less)						
51-100 employees	0.857	(0.757)	0.182	(0.504)	-0.575	(0.820)
101-250 employees	-0.696	(0.718)	0.048	(0.475)	0.054	(0.752)
251-500 employees	-0.220	(0.616)	-0.174	(0.457)	0.491	(0.683)
501-1000 employees	0.193	(0.608)	-0.239	(0.444)	-0.096	(0.819)
Over 1000 employees	0.647	(0.545)	0.773	(0.389)**	0.397	(0.583)
Organisation size (reference category: 999 employees or less)						
1000-4999 employees	1.101	(0.701)	-0.193	(0.429)	-0.271	(0.672)
5000-9999 employees	0.872	(0.685)	-0.532	(0.452)	0.299	(0.679)
10000 employees or more	-0.028	(0.606)	-1.068	(0.421)***	-0.188	(0.648)
Occupational groups represented (reference category: managers, senior officials and professionals)						
Managers, senior officials and professionals <i>and</i> non-management staff	-0.210	(0.612)	-0.719	(0.461)	1.137	(0.721)
Non-management staff only	-0.830	(0.601)	-0.873	(0.455)*	-0.123	(0.771)
Age (reference category: 44 years old or younger):						
45-49 years old	-0.286	(0.503)	-0.425	(0.342)	0.087	(0.647)
50-54 years old	-0.669	(0.536)	-0.841	(0.366)**	1.057	(0.658)
55-59 years old	0.317	(0.623)	-0.311	(0.408)	0.579	(0.723)
60 years old or older	-0.085	(0.618)	-0.853	(0.431)**	0.265	(0.772)
Time spent as Disability Champion (reference category: less than one year)						
1 to less than 2 years	-0.524	(0.565)	-0.492	(0.392)	0.090	(0.667)
2 to less than 5 years	-0.188	(0.488)	-0.729	(0.353)**	0.941	(0.614)
5 to less than 10 years	-0.677	(0.565)	-0.762	(0.411)*	1.336	(0.656)**
Hours per week spent on Disability Champion activity (reference category: less than one hour):						
1 to less than 2 hours	0.123	(0.544)	0.739	(0.358)**	-0.540	(0.562)
2 to less than 5 hours	0.082	(0.491)	0.803	(0.345)**	-0.610	(0.498)
5 hours or more	0.434	(0.568)	1.800	(0.420)***	-1.056	(0.576)*
Previously held another union post	1.212	(0.795)	-0.261	(0.542)	0.975	(0.827)
Currently holds another union post	-0.900	(0.538)*	0.149	(0.398)	-0.636	(0.619)
Female	-0.603	(0.368)	-0.459	(0.255)*	0.155	(0.412)
Ethnic minority	0.153	(0.561)	0.029	(0.382)	1.315	(0.619)**
Long-term illness, health problem or disability	-1.261	(0.406)***	-0.844	(0.274)***	0.533	(0.458)
Pseudo R2	0.339		0.165		0.379	
N	116		116		116	

Notes:

Coefficients given, standard errors in brackets. *** significant at 1 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; * significant at 10 percent
All dependent variables are dichotomous, except for 'Managers value Disability Champion's activities' (categorical measure)
Probit used except for the analysis of whether managers value Disability Champion's activities (ordered probit)

Table 5: Employer adherence to Two Ticks commitments and support for Disability Champions in Public and Private sector workplaces

	Employer interviews all disabled employees who meet the minimum criteria		Employer makes sure that all disabled employees can discuss, at least once a year how they can best develop and use their skills		Employer makes every effort to help any employee who becomes disabled to stay in work	
Two Ticks workplaces	2.123	(0.854)**	1.435	(0.613)**	0.929	(0.583)
Public sector	1.481	(0.882)*	0.755	(0.592)	0.354	(0.559)
Two Ticks workplaces x Public sector	-1.321	(0.974)	-1.673	(0.687)**	-0.855	(0.668)
Pseudo R2	0.275		0.083		0.116	
N	79		87		94	
<i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. public sector non-Two Ticks workplaces</i>	$-1.321 + 2.123 = 0.802$		$-1.673 + 1.435 = -0.238$		$-0.855 + 0.929 = 0.074$	
<i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. private sector Two Ticks workplaces</i>	$-1.321 + 1.481 = 0.160$		$-1.673 + 0.755 = -0.918$		$-0.855 + 0.354 = -0.501$	
	Employer takes action to make sure all staff know what support disabled people need from them		Employer looks every year at what has been done to support disabled employees and how to do it better		Number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to	
Two Ticks workplaces	1.297	(0.595)**	0.972	(0.671)	1.483	(1.337)
Public sector	0.855	(0.584)	0.344	(0.668)	0.851	(1.320)
Two Ticks workplaces x Public sector	-1.340	(0.670)**	-0.704	(0.738)	-0.759	(1.446)
Pseudo R2	0.081		0.097		0.002	
Adjusted R2						
N	93		82		63	
<i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. public sector non-Two Ticks workplaces</i>	$-1.340 + 1.297 = -0.043$		$-0.704 + 0.972 = -0.268$		$-0.759 + 1.483 = 0.724$	
<i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. private sector Two Ticks workplaces</i>	$-1.340 + 0.855 = -0.485$		$-0.704 + 0.344 = -0.360$		$-0.759 + 0.851 = 0.092$	

Notes:

Coefficients given, standard errors in brackets

*** significant at 1 percent; ** significant at 5 percent

All dependent variables are based on a 4 point scale where 4=always, 3=sometimes, 2=rarely and 1=never, except for the dependent variable for the number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to (count measure)

Ordered probit used except for the analysis of the number of Two Ticks commitments adhered to (OLS).

All equations control for: SIC major group; workplace size; organisation size

	Employer provides sufficient office space	Employer provides sufficient communication equipment	Employer provides reasonable time off
Two Ticks workplaces	-0.268 (0.853)	-0.280 (0.910)	-1.431 (1.105)
Public sector	-1.509 (0.767)**	-1.209 (0.775)	-0.428 (0.920)
Two Ticks workplaces x Public sector	0.730 (0.931)	1.232 (0.982)	1.846 (1.177)
Pseudo R2	0.322	0.318	0.446
N	105	105	105
<i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. public sector non-Two Ticks workplaces</i>	$0.730 + (-0.268) = 0.462$	$1.232 + (-0.280) = 0.952^*$	$1.846 + (-1.431) = 0.415$
<i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. private sector Two Ticks workplaces</i>	$0.730 + (-1.509) = -0.779$	$1.232 + (-1.209) = 0.023$	$1.846 + (-0.428) = 1.418$
	Employer provides information	Managers value disability champion's activities	Equality/disability forum in which the Disability Champion participates ^a
Two Ticks workplaces	-0.766 (0.896)	-0.109 (0.571)	2.511 (1.128)**
Public sector	-1.451 (0.834)*	-0.201 (0.508)	
Two Ticks workplaces x Public sector	1.249 (0.980)	0.010 (0.641)	
Pseudo R2	0.368	0.164	0.504
N	105	105	85
<i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. public sector non-Two Ticks workplaces</i>	$1.249 + (-0.766) = 0.483$	$0.010 + (-0.109) = -0.099$	
<i>Public sector Two Ticks vs. private sector Two Ticks workplaces</i>	$1.249 + (-1.451) = -0.202$	$0.010 + (-0.201) = -0.191$	

Notes:

Coefficients given, standard errors in brackets. ** significant at 5 percent; * significant at 10 percent

All dependent variables are dichotomous, except for 'Managers value Disability Champion's activities' (ordinal measure) and 'Number of forms of employer support provided' (count measure).

Probit used except for the analysis of whether managers value Disability Champion's activities (ordered probit)

All equations control for: whether the Disability Champion previously held a union post; whether the Disability Champion currently holds another union post; length of time as Disability Champion; hours spent on Disability Champion activities; gender; age; ethnicity; whether the Disability Champion has any long-term illness, health problem or disability; whether the Disability Champion represents managers/ professionals, non-managers or both groups; SIC major group; workplace size; organisation size

^a Analysis excludes private sector as none of the private sector Two Ticks workplaces have an equality or disability forum in which the Disability Champion participates

Appendix table: Independent and control variable means

<i>Independent variable:</i>	
Two Ticks Workplace	0.707
<i>Control variables: workplace characteristics</i>	
Sector:	
Public sector	0.733
Private sector	0.172
Not for profit/ voluntary sector	0.095
Industry group:	
Public administration and defence	0.302
Education	0.103
Health and Social Work	0.121
Transport, storage and communications	0.172
Other community, social and personal services	0.129
Other industry sector	0.172
Workplace size:	
50 employees or less	0.155
51-100 employees	0.086
101-250 employees	0.112
251-500 employees	0.155
501-1000 employees	0.129
Over 1000 employees	0.362
Organisation size:	
999 employees or less	0.121
1000-4999 employees	0.250
5000-9999 employees	0.207
10000 employees or more	0.422
<i>Control variables: individual characteristics</i>	
Occupational groups represented:	
Managers, senior officials and professionals	0.103
Managers, senior officials and professionals AND non-management staff	0.302
Non-management staff only	0.595
Disability Champion's age:	
44 years old or younger	0.198
45-49 years old	0.293
50-54 years old	0.207
55-59 years old	0.155
60 years old or older	0.147
Time spent as Disability Champion:	
Less than one year	0.164
1 to less than 2 years	0.181
2 to less than 5 years	0.491
5 to less than 10 years	0.164
Hours spent per week on Disability Champion activity:	
Less than 1 hour	0.224
1 to less than 2 hours	0.233
2 to less than 5 hours	0.328
5 hours or more	0.216
Disability Champion previously held another union post	0.931
Disability Champion currently holds another union post	0.879
Ethnic minority	0.103
Female	0.371
Long-term illness, health problem or disability	0.724
n=116	